

Franciscan Fathers taught the Indians to build elaborate aqueducts, irrigation ditches and mills. Here is where the Viceroy of Mexico brought Canary Islanders to live and where the Governor's palace was later erected. Over half a century before the cornerstone of this Capitol was laid the cornerstone of our San Fernando Cathedral was laid.

San Antonio became the meeting point of the Spanish-speaking and the English-speaking cultures on the American continents. It continues to have that distinction. But our city is not composed of only English and Spanish. To this city, which was built hundreds of miles beyond the then existing frontier of the United States, there came also the Germans, the French, and the Irish. And from La Villita of the Spanish, Germantown of the Germans, Military Plaza of the Americans, and the Irish flats of the Irish, there has truly been composed, in every sense of that tranquil word, a great and cosmopolitan city around which has grown the ninth most populated congressional district in the United States.

I speak here for San Antonio and the county of Bexar. I do it proudly. There is much for which to be proud that is not told in terms of history, but rather in those terms by which we take the measure of a city.

There is much I could tell you of our industries, our natural resources, our universities, our schools, our hospitals, our research foundations, our agricultural and livestock diversity, our rapidly growing population, our parks, our museums, our art centers, our multiplicity of tourist attractions, our recreational facilities, our trade and commerce and our ready access to Mexico and to the hills and plains of Texas.

Statistics on all these might burden you, for you have your own case to make for your own districts. However, the U.S. Congress has obviously thought well of San Antonio for many, many decades. If it were not so, the Congress would not have placed there so many facilities important to our Nation.

You have known of San Antonio as the home of many important defense installations: Fort Sam Houston, headquarters of the 4th Army, Brooke Army Medical Center, Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio Air Material Area, the Continental Division of the Military Air Transport Service, Lackland Air Force Base, Kelly Air Field, and others.

Past Congresses have known of San Antonio as a good place with good people—a place to which you can entrust the welfare of things important to the Nation and a place to which anyone can go to visit or to live with ease and appreciation.

(Mr. GONZALEZ at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DANIELS at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DANIELS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. WHITENER at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, responding to the personal and urgent request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I returned to Washington today to be present for the meeting of the House of Representatives.

I had hoped to be here when the call of the House was made at 12, but due to transportation difficulties I did not arrive in time to answer the rollcall.

Although I was not able to have my name recorded as present, I wish to have the Record show my presence soon thereafter.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. HEMPHILL at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, this morning early I received a message from our beloved Speaker of the House asking that I return to Washington for today's session.

I immediately made my plans to return but transportation difficulties delayed my arrival and I did not arrive in the Chamber until the rollcall had been completed. I regret this very much, but I do want the Record to show my presence here for the remainder of today's program.

THE MAJORITY WHIP

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the very gracious remarks made by my distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. I have had in this second session of this Congress the responsibility of majority whip. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure and an honor to work with you and the majority leader of this body.

The name "whip," in my opinion, is a misnomer because what we are trying to do is work with the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, understand their problems and understand and recognize the fact that all of them represent great districts in this magnificent country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege for me to work with you, with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and my colleagues on the Republican side.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293 today I was unavoidably detained. I should like the Record to show that had I been here I would have voted "yea."

REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

(Mr. MILLS at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the bill, H.R. 8754, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable SAM FRIEDEL. This bill has passed the House but no action has been taken on it by the other body.

The problem involved has to do with the treatment of redeemable ground rents, a common arrangement in Maryland. The bill would treat the buyer of property subject to a redeemable ground rent, for tax purposes, as having bought the land. This would make him eligible for the interest deduction and it would treat the seller as having received the current value of the ground rent.

This is a problem that has been unsettled for several years. It is my hope that legislation similar to H.R. 8754 as it passed the House this year can be enacted by Congress early next year. If it can be enacted promptly we will be able to make its application to homeowners retroactive. The application to sellers would, of course, be prospective.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10539) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will explain the legislation. It is a very important piece of legislation, and I want the House to know that it has the support of many of us on our side of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think it is desirable legislation and ought to pass.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will correct an inequitable situation that has developed since enactment of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in 1959—and which was not and could not be foreseen at that time—with regard to participation in the program by employee organizations.

In establishing the Federal employees health benefits program, the Congress gave recognition to the fact that a num-

OCT 13 1962

Approved For Release 1999/09/07 : CIA-RDP75-00061

22238

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

ber of employee organizations had already arranged group health insurance plans for their members in the absence of a Federal program. Specific provisions were, therefore, made in the law for participation in the program by these organizations in order to avoid the hardships and inequities that might arise if membership in these organizations might be drained off into a separate Federal program. Among the requirements that had to be met by organizations' plans was that they had been in operation on July 1, 1959, and that they apply for approval as carriers before December 31, 1959.

The law, as written, did serve the purpose of affording protection to those employee organizations who already had health benefit plans and who were approved as carriers. There is no evidence that any of them have lost membership.

However, subsequent developments have tended to impose undue hardships on those employee organizations who had no plan of their own or who may not have sought approval as a carrier. There is evidence to the effect that these organizations are losing membership to the organizations who do have health benefit plans.

In testifying before our committee, the national president of the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers, and Group Leaders reported that his organization is losing members in appreciable numbers, mainly because the organization has no health benefits plan. The local union of this organization in New York City has lost over 1,000 in the past 2 years. These employees are being attracted into other organizations which are able to offer a health benefit plan as a recruitment incentive.

The health benefits program was intended, as our committee's original report on the legislation indicated, to facilitate and strengthen the administration of the activities of the Government generally and to improve personnel administration in the Government. It was definitely not intended to be a recruitment aid or incentive for employee organization membership campaigns. It was certainly not the intent of Congress in enacting the legislation to place any employee organization in an unfair position in relation to any other organization.

The remedy for this situation lies in the enactment of H.R. 10539. It will, in effect, "open up" the program for a short period of time—to the end of this year—to any employee organization who may now wish to apply for approval as a carrier. It will eliminate the requirement that employee organization plans must have been in operation on July 1, 1959, and it will permit any organization to apply for approval up to December 31, 1962.

My committee is agreed that, regardless of other considerations, this is the only fair course that can be taken at this time. It further wishes to emphasize that this action should not set a precedent for similar action in the future. This so-called open season will exist for only this one short period of

time and organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers will only have this opportunity to do so.

It is expected that enactment of this legislation will entail only a nominal increase in certain administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again that this legislation seeks only to correct an inequity that has developed and which could not be foreseen when the Federal Employee Benefits Act was enacted. I sincerely urge the prompt enactment of H.R. 10539.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(i) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3001(i)) is amended by striking out "1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1962".

(b) Section 4(3) of such Act (73 Stat. 711; 5 U.S.C. 3003(3)) is amended by striking out "and which on July 1, 1959, provided health benefits to members of the organization".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM CHONG KOO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3215) for the relief of Kim Chong Koo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Chong Koo may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by the Reverend and Mrs. Kenneth J. Mitchell, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Kim Chong Koo pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RANSOM OF CUBAN PRISONERS—OR AID TO CASTRO AND COMMUNISM—OR CASTRO'S BLACKMAIL ATTEMPT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears we are adjourning barely before

the frost is on the pumpkin, as a matter of fact, just barely before the frost is on the pumpkin in northern Florida. However, there is substantial unfinished business before this Congress.

One item to which this Congress should have given consideration was the series of resolutions opposing the Cuban ransom deal which I introduced which would have had the effect, first, House Concurrent Resolution 479, May 31, 1962, of reversing the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service which has finally come properly to light in the morning papers, which declares that the ransoming of prisoners is "a charitable purpose." The ransoming of Cuban prisoners is a charitable purpose, according to the Treasury Department. Under the internal revenue laws, therefore, anyone making contributions to the Cuban Prisoner Committee can get tax deductions, so by the back door the taxpayers, as the result of loss of revenue to the Treasury, are paying a part of the bill.

The second resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 322, May 1961, would have vetoed in the first instance the \$20 million tractor-for-prisoner blackmail proposal and in the second instance House Concurrent Resolution 459, April 11, 1962, the \$62 million for prisoners blackmail proposed by Fidel Castro. This proposal of ransom and of indemnity—I think to put the thing in proper focus it is important to point out that Fidel Castro from the beginning has been demanding indemnity, and he has been demanding that this country pay to his country for damages done by the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs that failed.

There has never been any doubt in his mind what the money would be for—indemnity or ransom.

I was utterly amazed and I might say shocked a few months ago when I received from the Internal Revenue Department when I inquired, which resulted from my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 459 which would have abrogated the preliminary regulation that provides that money contributed to the Cuban Prisoner Committee would be tax deductible, that the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, in his letter to me in April based the decision of the Internal Revenue Service on this theory, and can you imagine such a theory:

Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am very interested in what the gentleman is saying, and his interest in this whole matter. I hope the gentleman will expand on and explain a bit more the background of the quotation that he has just given to us.

Mr. CRAMER. I would be delighted to do so. Can you imagine that theory? I wrote the Secretary and challenged him to cite examples. Quoting from Secretary Dillon's letter on the theory as

to why this redemption of prisoners or ransom of prisoners is considered to be a charitable activity, the Secretary said, and I read again:

Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

And I will include the entire incredible letter at the end of my remarks.

Let us bring this thing in focus. That leads to the conclusion of providing \$62 million to Fidel Castro whom the President himself called the enemy of the United States, by invoking the Trading with the Enemy Act effective February 7, 1962, which the President did to cut off the importation of Havana cigars coming in even through third friendly countries like Canada or the Canary Islands. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5847, April 11, 1962. The President by invoking the Trading with the Enemy Act through Presidential proclamation declared Fidel Castro, and properly so, as an enemy of free nations of the world and the United States in particular. Yet, with this Treasury ruling, we find the typical inconsistent position of the New Frontier—talk tough and use a powder puff—we find the New Frontier at this time permitting the collection of \$62 million that is going to be used for what purpose? I am just as sympathetic to the prisoners as anybody else. I realize and so does everyone in the world how they got there. It was because they were not given the air coverage at the Bay of Pigs that they were entitled to and promised. But I want to free all the people in Cuba. I want to see the 6 million people who live in Cuba free. They are all prisoners of communism and Castro. If we free 1,113 who are now in prison, is Castro going to make another demand on the other 100,000 Cubans in prison in Cuba? If we set this precedent, what are we faced with in the future, the great powerful freedom-loving United States of America? We are faced with a precedent of paying money in ransom for prisoners. To whom? To the enemy. Of paying indemnity to the enemy.

I thought our historical answer to such demands has been—"Millions for defense—not one cent for tribute."

That should be our answer today.

What is going to be the result? What is Fidel Castro going to do with this money? That is the point. What is the Cuban Government, the Communists, going to do with this money, and drugs, and foodstuffs?

Fidel Castro is going to use them to keep himself and the Communists and the many Russian technicians, and Red Chinese in Cuba, to keep them in power and continue to subject the 6 million citizens of Cuba to virtual slavery. That is what we are contributing to.

That is why I am opposed to this abortive proposal and have been from its inception with the April 17 failure of the invasion of 1961. If you recall, I introduced a resolution opposing the tractors deal just a few weeks after it was made. So we have to keep our minds on what is going to happen by giving this ransom aid. It is going to permit Fidel

Castro to stay in power, to permit the Communists to stay in power and to subjugate the 6 million people in Cuba, and at the same time challenge the freedoms of the rest of the Western Hemisphere, challenge it by exporting Communists to other countries of the hemisphere—even with arms.

I say this is wrong. And the gentleman from Illinois the other day said critically that I should be the general to lead the invasion forces. I would suggest that the gentleman from Illinois aid me, follow me, rather than criticize me—not necessarily as a general leading the invasion with words, as he said, but I am at least not guilty of being silent in opposing this abortive proposal that is against everything that we stand for, the dignity of America, the freedom of the hemisphere, and a strong position in opposition to atheistic communism.

Look where we are today. What position are we in? We find that Mr. Donovan, who just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, we find he was designated many months ago to do this negotiating. He obviously was given permission to do so.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will yield after I have finished.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is making a fine statement. It should be taken seriously. What concerns me is that the administration is still making Berlin its first and only challenge by the Communists and fails to watch out for Cuba, and the direct threat of the large military build-up to the United States, the American people, and the free world. Possibly Berlin is a diversion, with only small forces involved at present, but a two-headed thrust, when Cuba is carefully considered. I cannot understand why the administration thinks a military base in Cuba, could be "defensive." Why?

I believe that Cuba is equal to the challenge of communism that Berlin is. I know this from firsthand personal observation within the past 2 weeks.

On September 29 and 30, 1962, I went to the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and was there for several days working hard to get firsthand information for our U.S. security. It was a serious trip. We were flown into Guantanamo escorted by two U.S. fighter jets, and we were flown out escorted by two U.S. fighter jets. That shows it is serious business.

When I was there I was shocked to find that there are 3,200 Cuban employees employed at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, and 2,400 of them go home in the Cuban territory in Oriente Province every evening. These are the people that run the shipyard, and include craftsmen, metalworkers, welders, drillers, carpenters, every kind of a trade that we have in oversupply in the United States. These are the workers in this greatest U.S. naval base and shipyard. Why not American workmen?

I am from the city of Pittsburgh, and we have a tremendous number of un-

employed in heavy industry trained in this type of work, yet we cannot get the administration people to employ these people at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

Why this discrimination against American citizens, trained U.S. workers, and U.S. jobless veterans?

Castro's government in Cuba could shut our naval base down overnight by blocking the entry of these workers and diverting them as a ready made task force to the new Soviet-financed base now building near Havana. Guantanamo is the largest U.S. Navy base we have any place in the world, and ship basic repairs for the whole U.S. Atlantic Fleet are made here. Castro could shut Guantanamo down overnight simply by preventing the 2,400 employees from going in on any particular morning.

Another trouble is this: Because of this Cuban payroll, between \$6 and \$8 million in U.S. cash is going into Castro's coffers to keep Communism going in Cuba. That is being supported and paid for by U.S. taxpayers through payments made to these Cuban employees.

One of the tragedies of the Cuban situation is that at Guantanamo Bay we have only 1,500 military servicemen stationed there. Navy ships come and go, but they are not shore based. There are 3,200 Cuban employees who are able to take the U.S. Guantanamo base over at any given moment, many of them just as well physically built and equipment trained as any of the U.S. servicemen we have there.

Another problem that struck me very seriously is the neglect of this administration in not having the planes parked on the base runways protected at any time. There are no embankments or concrete revetments. Those planes are there just awaiting another Pearl Harbor. We need action for defense at Guantanamo and the base needs construction quick to modernize all installations. I am sure base personnel will heartily concur if asked.

Just 3 miles out of the base on one side, beyond Suicide Ridge, on one of the high hills beyond the Guantanamo Naval Base is a gun emplacement with large guns aimed right down into the naval base of the United States. In the other direction, about 5 miles away, there is another small mountain or high hill with more guns and artillery aiming down into the U.S. naval base. What are we doing about this?

At the base, we are yet unable to supply our own water, and have to depend on an outside Cuban water company. The source of supply is 4 or 5 miles outside the U.S. naval base. We have only a pipe coming out of there. There is no guard by the United States either on the reservoir or on the water system in the Cuban area. There is just one pipe, so that could be shut off at any time. We need salt water conversion equipment, and quick.

The administration should make clear we are putting standby carriers down there with an adequate reserve supply of water in case of a long siege, if necessary.

When I was there I learned about what was happening on the materials being shipped into Cuba at present.

The amount, description, and size of shipments is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, the point that struck me so forcefully was the rate of shipping going into Cuban ports. These ships consisted of large-mast ships of new design, laden part way up the mast in many instances, and on other occasions you could see from photographs that they had gun mounts, plane parts, missile-carrying PT boats on the decks.

Mr. Speaker, these ships are not going in one or two at a time. For the week ending September 29, when I was there, there were over 200 ships which went into Cuban ports under full steam taking military and civilian supplies that Cuba so badly needs. That is at the rate of 10,000 ships a year going to Cuba, and over half of them are ships which come from our so-called friends and allies of the free world and the neutralist countries.

That means there are 100 ships a week from the Communist bloc countries going into Cuba carrying ammunition and military supplies, which even this administration admits is at the rate of millions of dollars a year.

To me this is a major destructive threat to the whole of the State of Florida and to every State in the eastern part of the United States, and is a destructive threat to the security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that by only passing resolutions on Cuba and hitting with the powderpuff, and sending strong words to Khrushchev on Berlin, this administration is making a real mistake. We must be firm on Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I shall be glad to yield further when I have finished a few remarks that I have to make on this subject. Of course, the gentleman is eminently correct in many of his observations.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I have been advised that there are over 200 Mig planes now based in Cuba, and there has even been seen a Mig 21, their latest model. This is a tremendous threat to the United States, because with proper remodeling and change the Mig 19's and Mig 21's can carry 1,000-pound nuclear weapons which will endanger any American city up to about an 800-mile range. This is a real threat, in my opinion, and I think we need firm action on Cuba. The President should immediately meet with Prime Minister Khrushchev and make plain the U.S. position and our intended strong steps to protect ourselves, the Western Hemisphere, and the free world.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and his support of my position in bringing out some facts of tremendous importance. Of course, the gentleman's discussion of the buildup militarily in Cuba is the best evidence of the fact that we should not give to Castro

any American dollars which are being collected by this ransom committee, or any foodstuffs or any medicine that Castro can use to trade to Red China and Russia and certainly not any taxpayer-supported funds or foodstuffs. As we all know, they need foodstuffs and medicines and they certainly would like to have American dollars to help build up their war materiel, their big machine—that the administration admits has imported at least \$200 million worth of war materiel, making them the second military power in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse in the world for this, by direction, indirection, or regardless of the amount of compassion which we may have for the prisoners, and I have as much compassion as anyone else. I do not believe that we should help Castro stay in power. Castro admittedly, as all other Communist nations, have a serious food shortage, because the agrarian reforms which were pushed have not been successful, not only in Cuba, but anywhere in the Communist world. So, he needs foodstuffs badly. For what? To stay in power, to keep from losing control of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, how humiliating a position do we find ourselves in with these negotiations? We find a gentleman by the name of Donovan whom I say just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, negotiating on behalf of whom? The prisoners' committee, supposedly. But, he could not be negotiating or he would be violating the Logan Act, unless he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. There is not any question about it. He must have the authority of the Government of the United States. He has been in and out of the Attorney General's office on a number of occasions. The State Department has conferred with him. I would venture to say that he is being conferred with right now in Miami, assuming he is still there, because the State Department has in Miami at this time a representative, Mr. James L. Greenfield, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Information, Bureau of Public Affairs, who is at Homestead, Fla., now, and has been for some time.

He is in charge of what the administration calls mysteriously—this whole thing has been mysteriously—Project X. Project X is the preparation for the importation of the prisoners and the co-operation of the State Department to bring it about. So there is no doubt but what this not only has the condonation but the full back of the administration and is contrary to the best interests of this country.

I have asked the question, Does not this administration have compassion for Americans who are in prison in Cuba? I provided for the Record this week a list of 10 Americans who are in prison. The New Frontier is letting American prisoners rot in prisons around the world, including 21 in Cuban jails, on trumped-up charges, while backing the Cuban prisoner ransom blackmail deal as indemnity to Communist Castro because of the abortive failure of the invasion at the Bay of Pigs.

I charge that some 21 prisoners are held in jail largely on bogus charges, and many of them are in ill health. They are being mistreated, many of them. They are underfed. But we hear little of efforts to get them out of prison, while every administration pressure that can be brought to bear is being used to get the release of the Cuban prisoners, including the making of the contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee tax deductible, as I said before; sending Donovan to get on his knees in the name of the United States, to Castro, and influencing American pharmaceutical and food houses to make contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee and even planning to put in U.S. funds if needed.

Compassion for Cuban prisoners? Si. Compassion for American prisoners? No. That seems to be the policy of the New Frontier apparently, because the whole philosophy of this blackmail deal that the administration is trying to sell to the American people is a deal that helps Castro and the Communists stay in power with medicines, foodstuffs, and drugs, and is to apologize for the invasion failure. Maybe this whole contribution program ought to be renamed. Maybe they ought to call it the Kennedy conscience fund, instead.

The State Department refuses to give me the names of the prisoners, the 21 prisoners in the Cuban jails; 4 being held against their will in Red China; 1 in Russia; 4 unaccounted for in North Korea. Where is our compassion for our own citizens who are being held by the Communists throughout the world, if ransom is to be the sorry, humiliating approach? It is obvious that ransom and indemnity have never been the approach of this great country in fighting for freedom.

Despite the refusal of the State Department to give me the names of the Cuban prisoners I have been able to acquire the names of 18 of them, and here they are as reported to me by the only source available to me: Raefael del Pino, of New York and Miami; Austin Young, of Miami; James Wellington King, of Miami; Donald Joe Green, of York, S.C.; Alfred E. Gibson, of Mount Gilbuss, N.C.; James G. Dean, of Franklinville, N.C.; Thomas Baker of Dothan, Ala.; Eustace Danbrent, of Baltimore, Md.; Daniel Carswell, of East Chester, N.Y.; and Edmond Taransky, of New York City.

Those names I published earlier in the week. These are the others: Miss Marilyn Menger, of Miami. I do not know where the rest of them are from, but here are the names: Dario Prohias Bello, Martha O'Neal, Robert John Gentile, Juana Pedro Koop, Peter Joe Lambton, Richard Allen Peconaro, Leonard L. Schmidt.

Where is our compassion for these American citizens rotting in Cuban jails? Our attitude about American prisoners seems to be that nothing can be done for them short of efforts to do exactly what we should do, not only for the Cuban prisoners, but to free all of Cuba from Castro and communism. But our attitude about Cuban prisoners is that we must give in to Castro's ransom and indemnity demands and provide him

with much needed dollars, foodstuffs, and medicines, all of which he can trade off for more war materiel to be used against the United States of America and the freedom-loving countries of this hemisphere, and which he can use to build up communism in other countries in this hemisphere. That is what is wrong with this whole deal.

I hope that puts it in focus. Now, where are we? As of now we find Mr. Donovan back in Miami. Negotiations have been going on for months. I understand the Ransom Committee started in April and Donovan interceded in early August 1962.

The American people have not been told this. The American people are not told even now what the deal is. The American people have not been advised. The American people do not know what authority Mr. Donovan has to negotiate in regard to contributions by this Nation or its people to this ransom deal.

When I inquired of the State Department about it they admitted that they were doing "contingency planning." That is a good gobbledygook term, is it not? "Contingency planning" in the event that a request came from Mr. Donovan and the committee for contributions on the part of the United States.

I asked the State Department's Mr. Robert A. Hurwitch, Assistant Secretary of State, about this "contingency planning," "What authority do you have to spend 5 cents in paying ransom to an enemy, payment by the Government of the United States to Fidel Castro?" I have never knowingly and intentionally voted a nickel that could be used by the Government of the United States as payment to an enemy government, to Castro or communism.

He said in that respect that that, too, is part of the "contingency planning" to determine where moneys or foodstuffs or other matters of value are that could be made available to the committee. Is there any doubt that it is being given consideration?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I say to the gentleman from Florida in regard to the taxpayer's funds being used for a contingency of that kind that as a member of the subcommittee making appropriations for the State Department I would say there is no money that has been appropriated for that purpose. They never have submitted any request for money for that purpose.

As one member of the committee I shall inquire next year whether any has been used, and if it has, we will bring it to the attention of the House. But I would serve notice on the State Department now that here is no money that has been appropriated by our committee for that purpose. I would think they would be making a great mistake if they used funds appropriated for other purposes for any such purpose as the gentleman has now referred to.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I agree this should be the case. I think the gentleman is referring like-

wise to the Central Intelligence Agency. I am confident no one in this body has voted for those appropriations thinking they could be used for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for the campaign he has carried on in the last several days on this issue and say to him I thoroughly agree that not one dime of the American taxpayers should be spent for the liberation of the Cuban prisoners without the express authorization of Congress. This would be, it seems to me, the worst kind of tribute paid to Fidel Castro. I am sure the gentleman knows and every Member of the House knows that the money thus expended would be paid over eventually to the Russians.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. He put his finger exactly on the problem. I go further and say that dollars collected by the voluntary ransom committee likewise gives Castro just as much support and are of just as much value to him. That, too, should not be permitted.

I started to discuss briefly these negotiations. Look where the United States of America now is. We find that Mr. Donovan is back in Miami probably conferring with Mr. Greenfield, a representative of the State Department in project X. All this mystery, with no information made available to the American public. We find Mr. Donovan suggesting that there is a hitch in the negotiations. I assume the hitch is, and my best information is that the hitch is that Mr. Castro, wanting to get as much advantage as he can out of this propagandawise—and do not think he is the only one behind this. Do not think Khrushchev is not giving him advice on how to get the most propaganda advantage out of this. They are going to drag it along a little while, let the whole world know that the United States of America is willing to get on its knees to Fidel Castro, the puppet of Red China and Russia in Cuba.

So they are upping the ante—dragging on the negotiations—ask for more of everything—more money, more foodstuffs, more medicine, additional guarantees, supply new lists that Castro wants filled, change the ground rules. How long is this humiliating experience going on? He must have gotten word from Khrushchev. He must have gotten word from Mao Tse-tung that he is making points in the world propagandawise—keep it up, keep the United States of America on its knees, let the world know Mr. Donovan who has authority to negotiate from the U.S. Government that he is on his knees to Fidel Castro, Khrushchev and Mao must be saying. The asininity of this thing. How did we ever get ourselves in such a position is hardly understandable to me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have been interested to know how Mr. Donovan gets into the picture and what interest he has in this business. Who is financing him? What authority has he been delegated by the U.S. Government? Why do we have highly paid diplomats by the score? Are they unable to carry on negotiations, if negotiations should be carried on? Is this administration saying it is necessary to find someone from outside of the Government to carry on these negotiations? I do not understand the situation at all.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is asking many questions that, I am sure, are in the minds of the American people as well as people throughout the world. This man has no portfolio. This man has no Senate confirmation. This man has not put his credentials before the American people for examination. This man is a private citizen.

I always felt the Logan Act prevented a citizen of the United States from dealing with foreign countries, even a friendly country let alone an enemy. So the only way that he could be negotiating without violating the law would be if he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. So we can only assume that he does have, but I hasten to add he should never have gotten that kind of permission from me. So we are being forced now to get down on our knees and crawl before Castro and the Communists and to accede to the indemnity demands resulting from this abortive invasion failure and to accede to the demands for ransom of a bearded, power hungry madman, Fidel Castro, who is threatening the security of this entire hemisphere. That gives the Communists a beachhead in this hemisphere the likes of which they never had in the history of communism. Now they want us to crawl even more. It is time to put a stop to it.

I wrote for consideration of my resolution calling for an end to this humiliation and aid to Castro. This is some of the unresolved business of this session. The request follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply disturbed by reports that the President, through Mr. Donovan, is negotiating to bargain away American dollars and/or foodstuffs to Communist Castro who recently, in a strong resolution passed by the House, was declared to be an enemy of the U.S. Government, and it appears from the latest news reports that there are proposals being made to pay him in dollars from CIA funds.

This is about the greatest abuse of Presidential discretion as I can remember in the history of this country because I, as a Member of Congress, have at no time, knowingly or intentionally, ever voted for any funds, CIA or in any other authorization or appropriation bill, that would permit the President to spend taxpayers' money to pay off ransom and indemnity demands, to give into blackmail threats by an enemy government and, in particular, Fidel Castro.

As you know, I have pending House Concurrent Resolution 459, which provides: "That it is the sense of Congress that this Government oppose the trading of dollars for humans as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba and request the President

to withhold any further Executive approval of such commerce or trade with the enemy, to refuse to permit the issuance of visas to visitors to Cuba for purposes of negotiation, to refuse to permit shipment or payment of such dollars to Cuba from the United States, and to refuse to permit gifts and contributions made for such a trade to be deducted for income tax purposes."

In view of the emergency nature of this situation, and the obvious public indignation against it, as evidenced in the tractor deal which was finally disallowed by the President, and this obviously being contrary to the basic policy established by Congress itself just a few weeks ago in the Cuban resolution, I am asking for immediate hearings by your committee to consider this entire matter and my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 459.

The people are entitled to know all the facts and I am confident that the Congress of the United States does not want to be a party to the appropriation of money of food-suffs to be turned over to Fidel Castro. America demands that Castro and communism in this hemisphere be defeated—not supported.

If the Congress does not stop this unwholesome, degrading, and humiliating blackmail deal, the prestige of the United States will be forever irreparably harmed. I am extremely sympathetic to the Bay of Pigs invasion forces held in prison but I call your attention to the fact that, according to the Department of State, American prisoners are being held in Cuba, as well as in North Korea and in Red China, and no effort is being made for their release because of our strong policy against the ransoming of prisoners. Likewise, all of Cuba is a prison under Castro, let alone the hundreds of thousands who are known to be in jail, and our efforts should be to help the Cuban refugees free their entire country rather than put that date off indefinitely by supporting Castro and his Communist regime to the tune of \$60 million. This deal is an American surrender of principles and appeasement of communism.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your letters of April 25, 1962, to the President and to me, about the deductibility of contributions to the Cuban Families Committee for the Liberation of Prisoners of War, Inc.

Our records show that the committee filed an application in August 1961, with the Internal Revenue Service requesting exemption from income tax as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The committee also requested a determination that contributions made to it would be deductible by the donors in accordance with section 170 of the code.

Early in October, in amplification of its request, the committee informed the Internal Revenue Service that it hoped to negotiate the release of prisoners by the Castro regime in exchange for tractors. This related back to the earlier Castro demands, and at no time from the filing of the original application to the tentative granting of the exemption on December 6, was there prior knowledge, as your letter suggests, of any new Castro prisoner trade offer.

Section 501(c)(3) provides that corporations and foundations which are "organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific * * * (and) educational purposes" shall be exempt from taxation. Contributions to organizations which enjoy exempt status under section 501(c)(3) are

deductible under the provisions of code section 170. The application and supplemental evidence submitted by the committee indicate that its primary purpose, on which its entitlement to exemption depends, is the liberation, relief and rehabilitation of the prisoners now being held in Cuba. Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity. Similarly, it has frequently been recognized that the relief and rehabilitation of persons in distress is charitable.

Since the purposes for which the committee was formed fall within the exemption provisions of the code, the organization was tentatively granted exemption by the Service in a letter ruling dated December 6, 1961. The letter states that if the committee is operated in accordance with its stated purposes and in the manner indicated by the evidence submitted, it will be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax and contributions received by it will be tax deductible. Before the issuance of the December 6 ruling letter, we were advised by the Justice Department that the activities of the committee would not entail any violation of the Logan Act. Also, we were informed by the State Department that there were no objections to the issuance of a favorable ruling from a foreign policy point of view.

You have requested that the ruling issued to the committee be rescinded. However, we believe that under a proper construction of the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and on the basis of the facts submitted to us, the committee is entitled to exempt status. Therefore, we can see no appropriate legal basis for the revocation of the tentative ruling issued to the organization.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. On October 6 the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] obtained unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes at the appropriate time on the last day of the session. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have just taken advantage of that leave and have introduced that material at the close of my remarks following the last bill.

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GALLAGHER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 87TH CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give the House a brief summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the 87th Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I will insert in the Appendix of the Record at a later date a more detailed statement.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the work of this Congress will be applauded wherever freedom finds voice.

In both sessions of this historic Congress, 1961 and 1962, President Kennedy has seen enacted into law an unusually high percentage of his recommendations. This great body of forward-looking legislation sets the foundations for a new decade of peace, progress, and prosperity in the challenging 1960's.

Two illustrious names in American history have guided these sessions in the House—the revered Sam Rayburn, of Texas, in the first session, and the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, in the second. We owe a public tribute to these great architects of effective self-government.

By building impregnable military security we have renewed and revitalized the constructive forces of growth and progress everywhere in the free world.

And our own internal security has been strengthened and buttressed by new legislation to punish espionage, subversion, and betrayal at home.

The world around, the whole structure of freedom commands new authority, dignity, and power.

America faces the future with unblinking confidence, for everywhere the evil powers of destruction and moral decay are in check before the awesome might of freedom under God.

Looking back 20 months to the opening days of the 87th Congress, in January 1961, the Nation now sees clearly that our legislative program has been successful on two fronts—a broad offense against Communist aggression and subversion around the world, and a daring new offensive against distress, disaster, unemployment, and economic dislocation at home.

No boast is hinted that all of our challenging problems of national development have been solved. But we have recorded an inspiring effort to advance the central aspirations of our times—world peace, national security, and solid economic growth in a beckoning climate of justice and human dignity.

Throughout these 2 years, we have hammered out on the anvil of free debate in the Halls of Congress virtually all of the great issues and problems of our day.